Attorney's Docket No.: 5500\*103

TO: ASSISTANT GOMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS WASHINGTON, DC 20231

# TRANSMITTAL FORM

Applicant(s):	Michel Andre Crepear
Serial No.:	09/920,365
Filing Date:	August 3, 2001
Group Art Unit:	1615
Examiner:	Simon J. Oh

ENCLOSURES		
Request for Continued Examination Transmittal		
Associate Power of Attorney	Petition for Extension of Time (2 months)	
Response to Missing Parts:		
Declaration for Patent Application	Appeal Brief Reply Brief	
Genetic Sequence Listing		
	Other Enclosures:	

### **FEE AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required in connection with this correspondence, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 03-2775. This sheet is submitted in duplicate.

Date: January 22, 2003

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP P.O. Box 2207 Wilmington, Delaware 19899 (302) 888-6420 Liza D. Hohenschutz, Reg. No. 33,7120

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on January 22, 2003 with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

Arry L. Harrin



#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.8 (a)).

I hereby certify that the attached papers or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 2023

And the

Atty. Docket #: 5500\*103

**ART UNIT: 1615** 

**EXAMINER: Simon J. Oh** 

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**APPLICANT: Michel Andre Crepeau** 

**SERIAL NO: 09/920,365** 

FILED: August 3, 2001

FOR: "CONCENTRATED WATER-DISPERSIBLE

VITAMIN COMPOSITIONS"

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

## RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

This is in response to the Office Action of October 22, 2002, the time for a response to which is set to expire on January 22, 2003.

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Claims 1-9 stand rejected. Reconsideration of the present application is requested in view of the following remarks.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kardys (U.S. Patent No. 3,932,634) in view of Tipton *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,747,058). The basis for the rejection is that it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one